A Sample Path Convergence Time Analysis of Drift-Plus-Penalty for Stochastic Optimization

Xiaohan Wei, Hao Yu and Michael J. Neely

arXiv:1510.02973v2 [math.OC] 31 Oct 2015

***Abstract*—This paper considers the problem of minimizing the time average of a controlled stochastic process subject to multiple time average constraints on other related processes. The probability distribution of the random events in the system is unknown to the controller. A typical application is time average power minimization subject to network throughput constraints for different users in a network with time varying channel conditions. We show that with probability at least $1-2\delta$, the classical drift-plus-penalty algorithm provides a sample path $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ approximation to optimality with a convergence time $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\max\{\log^2\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^3\frac{2}{\delta}\})$, where $\varepsilon>0$ is a parameter related to the algorithm. When there is only one constraint, we further show that the convergence time can be improved to $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\log^2\frac{1}{\delta}\right)$.**

I. Introduction

Consider a slotted time system with slots $t\in\{1,2,3,\cdots\}$. At each time slot, a controller observes a random event $w[t]$ which is i.i.d. and takes values in an arbitrary set W with probability distribution unknown to the controller. After observing the random event, the controller picks a decision vector $\mathbf{z}[t]\triangleq(z_0[t],\ z_1[t],\cdots,\ z_L[t])\in\mathcal{A}(w[t])$, where $\mathcal{A}(w[t])\in\mathbb{R}^{L+1}$ is an option set which possibly depends on $w[t]$.

The goal is to minimize the time average of the objective $z_0[t]$ subject to L time average constraints on processes $z_l[t]$ respectively. Let

$$\overline{z}_l=\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_l[t],\ l\in\{0,1,2,\cdots,L\}.$$

Then, we write the stochastic optimization problem as

$$\min\ \ \overline{z}_0 \tag{1}$$
$$\text{s.t.}\ \ \overline{z}_l\le 0,\ \ \forall l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}, \tag{2}$$
$$\mathbf{z}[t]\in\mathcal{A}(w[t]),\ \forall t\in\{1,2,\cdots\}, \tag{3}$$

where both the minimum and constraints are taken in an almost sure (probability 1) sense. We assume the problem is feasible and the minimum does exist. The following section briefly introduces the framework of the drift-plus-penalty algorithm.

A. The drift-plus-penalty algorithm

Define L virtual queues $Q_l[t],\ l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}$ which are 0 at $t=1$ and updated as follows:

$$Q_l[t+1]=\max\{Q_l[t]+z_l[t],0\}. \tag{4}$$

The authors are with the Electrical Engineering department at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

This material is supported in part by the NSF grant 0964479.

Meanwhile, denote $\mathbf{Q}[t]=(Q_1[t],\ Q_2[t],\ \cdots,\ Q_L[t])$. The basic intuition behind the virtual queue idea is that if an algorithm can stabilize $Q_l[t],\ \forall l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}$, then, the average "rate" $\overline{z}_l$ is below 0 and the constraints are satisfied. Then, the algorithm proceeds as follows via a fixed trade off parameter $V>0$:

- At the beginning of each time slot t, observe $w[t]$, $Q_l[t]$ and take $\mathbf{z}[t]\in\mathcal{A}(w[t])$ so as to solve the following unconstrained optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}[t]\in\mathcal{A}(w[t])}\ \ Vz_0[t]+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]. \tag{5}$$

  In other words, the solution treats $Q_l[t]$ and $w[t]$ as given constants and chooses $\mathbf{z}[t]$ in $A(w[t])$ to minimize the above expression.
- Update the virtual queues

$$Q_l[t+1]=\max\{Q_l[t]+z_l[t],0\}\ \ \forall l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}.$$

B. Related works

The algorithm introduced in the previous section is closely related to the idea of opportunistic scheduling, which was pioneered by Tassiulas and Ephremides in [1] and [2]. A max-weight algorithm was first introduced in their works to stabilize multiple parallel queues in data networks. The drift-plus-penalty algorithm is developed to maximize the network utility or minimize energy consumption under the queue stability constraints in the network ([3] and [4]). A sample path asymptotic analysis is presented in [5] using the strong law of large numbers for supermartingale difference sequences. Under mild assumptions on $\mathbf{z}[t]$, it shows that the drift-plus-penalty algorithm satisfies constraints (2)-(3) and achieves the near optimality

$$\overline{z}_0\le z^{opt}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),$$

with probability 1, where z^{opt} is the minimum achieved by the optimization problem (1)-(3).

Next, consider the problem of convergence time analysis, i.e. the number of slots needed for the desired near optimality to kick in. Most previous works (such as [6], [7] and [8]) focus on the expected time average performance and only requires the constraints to hold in an expected sense. The work in [6] proves that the same drift-plus-penalty algorithm described

in section I-A gives an $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ approximation defined in the following manner:

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}\left[z_0[t]\right] \leq z^{opt} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\mathbb{E}\left[z_l[t]\right] \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),\ \forall l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\}, \tag{7}$$

with the convergence time $T = \mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon^2)$. Work in [8] demonstrates near-optimal $\mathcal{O}(\log(1/\varepsilon)/\varepsilon)$ convergence time for one constraint with a piece-wise linearity assumption. An improved convergence time of $\mathcal{O}(1/\varepsilon)$ is shown in [7] in deterministic problems with piece-wise linearity assumption.

The drift-plus-penalty algorithm can also be viewed as one kind of dual algorithm. A similar stochastic dual algorithm for constrained stochastic optimization in [9] is shown to satisfy the constraints and achieve the near optimality asymptotically with probability 1 as well. A similar $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ convergence time result for a dual subgradient method is shown in [10] in the case of deterministic convex optimization. Related work in [11] applies a dual subgradient method for non-stochastic optimization in a network scheduling problem. The work in [12] further considers the dual subgradient method with stochastic approximations in network scheduling. Other related optimization methods for queueing networks are also treated via fluid limits for Markov chains in [13][14][15][16].

C. Contributions and roadmap to proof

This paper considers the drift-plus-penalty algorithm for stochastic optimization problem (1)-(3) and, for the first time, gives a sample path convergence time result. Specifically, for a general stochastic optimization of the form (1)-(3), we show that for any $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, the drift-plus-penalty algorithm gives an $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ approximation as follows:

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} z_0[t] \leq z^{opt} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),$$

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} z_l[t] \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),\ \forall l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\},$$

with convergence time $T \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\max\left\{\log^2\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^3\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}$. Compared to (6)-(7), we removed the expectations at the cost of an extra logarithm factor on the convergence time. Furthermore, when there is only one constraint in (1)-(3) (i.e. $L = 1$), we show that the convergence time can be improved to $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\log^2\frac{1}{\delta}\right)$.

The proof starts by showing the sum-up drift-plus penalty expression is a supermartingale. The prime difficulty is the difference sequence of this supermartingale is potentially unbounded, which prevents us from using established concentration inequalities. We overcome this difficulty by truncation. Specifically, in the general case where there are multiple constraints, we proceed with the following three steps:

1) Truncate the original supermartingale using a stopping time, which gives us another supermartingale with bounded difference.
2) Show that the tail probability of the original supermartingale is upper bounded by the tail probability of the truncated one plus the probability of occurrence of the stopping time.
3) Bound the tail probability of the truncated supermartingale by a concentration result and bound the probability of stopping time occurrence by exponential decay of the virtual queue processes.

In the special case where there is only one constraint, we show that performing a truncation using a deterministic constant instead of a stopping time is enough to construct a supermartingale with bounded difference, thereby gives a better convergence time result.

II. Assumptions and Preliminaries

A. Optimization over randomized stationary algorithms

A key feature of the drift-plus-penalty algorithm is that it performs without knowing the probability distribution of the random events. Suppose for the moment that the controller does know the probability distribution of the random events. Then, consider the following class of *randomized stationary algorithms*: At the beginning of each time slot t, after observing the random event $w[t]$, the controller selects a decision vector $\mathbf{z}^*[t] \in \mathcal{A}(w[t])$ according some probability distribution which depends only on $w[t]$.

Since $w[t]$ is i.i.d. over slots, the processes $\{z_l[t]\}_{t=1}^{\infty},\ l \in \{0,1,2,\cdots,L\}$ are all stationary and i.i.d. over slots under this class of algorithms. By the strong law of large numbers,

$$\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} z_l^*[t] = \mathbb{E}\left[z_l^*[t]\right],\quad w.p.1,\quad \forall t,\ \forall l \in \{0,1,\cdots,L\}.$$

Furthermore, it can be shown (for example, in [4]) that the optimum of the problem (1)-(3) is achievable through this class of algorithms. That being said, there exists a randomized stationary algorithm such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[z_0^*[t]\right] = z^{opt} \tag{8}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[z_l^*[t]\right] \leq 0,\ \forall l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\}, \tag{9}$$

where z^{opt} is the minimum achieved by (1)-(3).

B. Basic assumptions

Assumption 1: For any $t \in \{1,2,\cdots\}$, the vector $\mathbf{z}[t] \in \mathcal{A}(w[t])$ satisfies

$$|z_0[t]| \leq z_{\max},$$

$$\sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^{L} z_l[t]^2} \leq B.$$

where $z_{\max}$ and B are positive constants.

In addition, we also need the following compactness assumption.

Assumption 2: For any $w \in W$, the set $\mathcal{A}(w)$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{L+1}$.

This assumption is not crucial in our analysis. However, it guarantees that there is always an optimal solution to (5)

within the drift-plus-penalty algorithm, and thereby relieves us from unnecessary complexities in the convergence time analysis.

Assumption 3: (ξ-slackness) There exists a *randomized stationary policy* $\mathbf{z}^{(\xi)}[t]$ such that all constraints are satisfied with $\xi > 0$ slackness, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{z}_l^{(\xi)}[t]\right] \leq -\xi, \quad \forall l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}.$$

The sets $\mathcal{A}(w[t])$ are not required to have any additional structure beyond these assumptions. In particular, the sets $\mathcal{A}(w[t])$ might be finite, infinite, convex, or nonconvex.

C. Interpretation of drift-plus-penalty

We define the squared norm of the virtual queue vector as

$$\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2 = \sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]^2.$$

Define the drift of the virtual queue vector as follows:

$$\Delta[t] = \frac{1}{2}\left(\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2 - \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2\right).$$

Then, the drift-plus-penalty algorithm observes the vector $\mathbf{Q}[t]$ and random event $w[t]$ at every slot t, and then makes a decision $\mathbf{z}[t] \in \mathcal{A}(w[t])$ to greedily minimize an upper bound on the *drift-plus-penalty* expression

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Delta[t] + Vz_0[t] \mid \mathbf{Q}[t], w[t]\right].$$

To bound $\Delta[t]$, for any $l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$, we square (4) from both sides and use the fact that $\max\{z, 0\}^2 \leq z^2$ to obtain:

$$Q_l[t+1]^2 \leq Q_l[t]^2 + z_l[t]^2 + 2Q_l[t]z_l[t].$$

According to Assumption 1,

$$\Delta[t] + Vz_0[t] \leq \frac{B^2}{2} + \sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] + Vz_0[t]. \tag{10}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\Delta[t] + Vz_0[t] \mid \mathbf{Q}[t], w[t]\right] \\
\leq &\frac{B^2}{2} + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] + Vz_0[t] \;\middle|\; \mathbf{Q}[t], w[t]\right] \\
= &\frac{B^2}{2} + \sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] + Vz_0[t], \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

where the equality comes from the fact that given $\mathbf{Q}[t]$ and $w[t]$, the term $\sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] + Vz_0[t]$ is a constant. Thus, as we have already seen in section I-A, the drift-plus-penalty algorithm observes the vector $\mathbf{Q}[t]$ and random event $w[t]$ at slot t, and minimizes the right hand side of (11).

III. Convergence Time Analysis

A. Construction of a supermartingale

Define $\mathcal{F}_t$ as the system history up to slot t.[1] The following lemma illustrates the key feature of the drift-plus-penalty algorithm.

Lemma 1: The following inequality holds regarding regarding the drift-plus-penalty algorithm for any $t \in \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\}$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[V(z_0[t] - z^{opt}) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \leq 0, \tag{12}$$

where z^{opt} is the optimal value achieved by (1)-(3).

Proof: Since the drift-plus-penalty algorithm minimizes the term on the right hand side of (11) over all possible decisions at time t, it must achieve smaller value on that term compared to that of best randomized stationary policy $\mathbf{z}^*[t]$. Formally, this is

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] + Vz_0[t] \leq \sum_{l=1}^{L} Q[t]z_l^*[t] + Vz_0^*[t].$$

Since for any $l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, L\}$, $Q_l[t] = \max\{Q_l[t-1] + z_l[t-1], 0\} \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, taking expectations from both sides regarding $w[t]$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] + Vz_0[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \\
\leq &\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{L} Q[t]z_l^*[t] + Vz_0^*[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that the randomized stationary policy $\mathbf{z}^*[t]$ is i.i.d. and thus independent of the virtual queues at time t. Using the two inequalities (8) and (9), it follows:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] + Vz_0[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \leq Vz^{opt},$$

which implies the claim. ■

With the help of above lemma, we construct a supermartingale as follows,

Lemma 2: Define a process $\{X[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ such that $X[0] = 0$ and

$$X[t] = \sum_{i=1}^{t}\left(V(z_0[i] - z^{opt}) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[i]z_l[i]\right).$$

Then, $\{X[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale.

Proof: First, it is obvious that $|X[t]| < \infty$ and $X[t] \in \mathcal{F}_t$ for any $t \geq 0$. Then, by (12), the following holds for any $t \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[X[t]|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \\
= &\mathbb{E}\left[V(z_0[t] - z^{opt}) + \sum_{l=1}^{L} Q_l[t]z_l[t] \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] + X[t-1] \\
\leq &X[t-1].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\{X[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale. ■

[1] Formally, $\mathcal{F}_t$ is the sigma algebra containing all random variables from slot 1 to slot t.

B. Truncation by a stopping time

Although the process $\{X[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale, its difference sequence $V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]$ is potentially unbounded because the virtual queue process $\{Q_l[t]\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ is not bounded. On the other hand, the bounded difference property is crucial for any well established concentration result to work (see [17] for details). But we still have one card to play, which is the idea of truncation by a stopping time. Intuitively, we can "stop" the process whenever the difference gets too large and this stopped process then satisfies the bounded difference property. This idea has been used under different scenarios (see [18] and [19] for some example applications). We start with the basic definition of stopping time.

Definition 1: Given a probability space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P)$ and a filtration $\{\varnothing,\Omega\}=\mathcal{F}_0\subseteq\mathcal{F}_1\subseteq\mathcal{F}_2\cdots$ in $\mathcal{F}$. A stopping time N is a random variable such that for any $n<\infty$,

$$\{N=n\}\in\mathcal{F}_n,$$

i.e. the event that the stopping time occurs at time n is contained in the information up to time n.

The following theorem formalizes the idea of truncation.

Theorem 1: (*Theorem 5.2.6 in [18]*) If N is a stopping time and $X[n]$ is a supermartingale, then $X[n\wedge N]$ is also a supermartingale, where $a\wedge b\triangleq\min\{a,b\}$.

The following lemma introduces a truncated process $\{Y[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ which has some desired properties.

Lemma 3: For any $c_1>0$, define

$$\tau\triangleq\inf\{t>0:\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|>c_1\}.$$

Meanwhile, for any $t\geq 0$, define

$$Y[t]=X[t\wedge(\tau-1)],$$

then, $Y[t]$ has the following two properties:
1.The process $\{Y[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale.
2.The process $\{Y[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ has bounded one step differences as follows,

$$|Y[t+1]-Y[t]|\leq c_2,\ \forall t\geq 0,$$

where $c_2=2Vz_{\max}+Bc_1$.

Proof: Proof of Property 1: In order to apply theorem 1 it is enough to show that $\tau-1$ is a valid stopping time, i.e. $\{\tau-1=t\}\in\mathcal{F}_t,\ \forall t\geq 0$. Indeed, since $Q_l[t+1]=\max\{Q_l[t]+z_l[t],0\}\in\mathcal{F}_t,\ \forall t\geq 0$ and $\forall l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}$, it follows,

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\tau-1=t\}=\{\tau=t+1\}\\=&\{\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|>c_1\}\cap\{\|\mathbf{Q}[i]\|\leq c_1,\ \forall i\leq t\}\in\mathcal{F}_t.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\{Y[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale truncated by a stopping time, we apply Theorem 1 to conclude that it is also a supermartingale.

Proof of Property 2: This properties is intuitively obvious that given the process is not stopped at t (i.e. $\tau-1\geq t$), $\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|\leq c_1$ and $|Y[t]-Y[t-1]|\leq 2Vz_{\max}+Bc_1$. On the other hand, given the process is stopped at t (i.e. $\tau-1<t$), $|Y[t]-Y[t-1]|=0$. The formal proof is provided in Appendix A. ∎

Lemma 4: Consider a supermartingale $\{Y[t]\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ with bounded difference

$$|Y[t]-Y[t-1]|\leq c_2,\ \forall t.$$

For any fixed scale T and any $\lambda>0$, the following concentration inequality holds:

$$Pr(Y[t]\geq\lambda)\leq\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2Tc_2^2}\right).$$

This is one generalized version of Azuma's inequality to supermartingales. Similar types of supermartingale concentration inequalities and proofs can be found in Chapter 2 of [17]. For completeness, we offer a self-contained proof in Appendix B.

The following lemma gives a concentration result for $\{X[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ which is a supermartingale with possibly unbounded differences. The result is proved by a union bound argument.

Lemma 5: For the same sequence $\{X[t]\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ defined in Lemma 2, fix a time period T and define the "bad event" for each $t\in\{1,2,\cdots,T\}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}_t\triangleq\{\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|>c_1\}$$

for some $c_1>0$. Then, we have for any $\lambda>0$,

$$Pr\left(X[T]\geq\lambda\right)\leq\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2Tc_2^2}\right)+\sum_{t=1}^{T}Pr\left(\mathcal{B}_t\right).$$

Proof: We first show that for any $t\geq 1$, $\{X[t]\neq Y[t]\}\subseteq\cup_{i=1}^{t}\mathcal{B}_i$, where $\mathcal{B}_i$ is the bad set defined in the lemma. The proof is simple. Any event $X[t]\neq Y[t]$ is equivalent to $X[t\wedge(\tau-1)]\neq X[t]$. Thus, it follows $t\wedge(\tau-1)\neq t$. This implies $\tau-1<t$ and $\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|$ must exceed c_1 within the first t slots. Thus, the event $\{X[t]\neq Y[t]\}$ must belong to $\cup_{i=1}^{t}\mathcal{B}_i$.

Now, we can bound the probability that $X[T]$ ever gets large using a union bound, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}Pr\left(X[T]\geq\lambda\right)=&Pr\left(X[T]=Y[T],\ Y[T]\geq\lambda\right)\\&+Pr\left(X[T]\neq Y[T],\ X[T]\geq\lambda\right)\\\leq&Pr\left(Y[T]\geq\lambda\right)+Pr(X[T]\neq Y[T])\\\leq&\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2Tc_2^2}\right)+Pr\left(\cup_{t=1}^{T}\mathcal{B}_t\right)\\\leq&\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2Tc_2^2}\right)+\sum_{t=1}^{T}Pr(\mathcal{B}_t).\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality uses $\{X[t]\neq Y[t]\}\subseteq\cup_{i=1}^{t}\mathcal{B}_i$ and Lemma 4. ∎

C. Exponential decay of the virtual queue

According to Lemma 5, it remains to show that the probability that the bad event occurs (i.e. $Pr(\mathcal{B}_t)$) is small. The following lemma comes from the ξ-slackness assumption which states that $\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|$ is not expected to be very large.

Lemma 6: The following holds for any $t\in\mathbb{N}^+$ under the drift-plus-penalty algorithm,

$$\begin{aligned}&|\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|-\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\||\leq B,\\&\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|-\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\||\mathbf{Q}[t]\right]\leq\begin{cases}B, & \text{if } \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|\leq C_0V;\\-\xi/2, & \text{if } \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|>C_0V.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

where $C_0 \triangleq (4z_{\max} + \frac{B^2}{V} - \frac{\xi^2}{4V})/\xi$.

Proof: First of all, according to Assumption 1, the increase (or decrease) of all queues are bounded during each slot, it follows for any t,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\| - \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\||\\
\leq&\left|\sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^{L}(Q_l[t]+z_l[t])^2} - \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]^2}\right|\\
\leq&\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| + \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^{L}z_l[t]^2} - \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|\\
=&\sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^{L}z_l[t]^2} \leq B.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, suppose $\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| > C_0V$. Then, since the drift-plus-penalty algorithm minimizes the term on the right hand side of (11) over all possible decisions at time t, it must achieve smaller value on that term compared to that of ξ-slackness policy $\mathbf{z}^{(\xi)}[t]$. Formally, this is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t] + Vz_0[t] \;\middle|\; \mathbf{Q}[t], w[t]\right]\\
\leq&\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q[t]z_l^{(\xi)}[t] + Vz_0^{(\xi)}[t] \;\middle|\; \mathbf{Q}[t], w[t]\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Substitute this bound into the right hand side of (11) and take expectations from both sides gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\Delta[t] + Vz_0[t] \mid \mathbf{Q}[t]\right]\\
=&\frac{B^2}{2} + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l^{(\xi)}[t] + Vz_0^{(\xi)}[t] \;\middle|\; \mathbf{Q}[t]\right].
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2 - \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2 \mid \mathbf{Q}[t]\right]\\
\leq&B^2 + 2\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]\mathbb{E}\left[z_l^{(\xi)}[t]\middle|\,\mathbf{Q}[t]\right] + 4Vz_{\max}\\
\leq&B^2 - 2\xi\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t] + 4Vz_{\max}\\
\leq&B^2 - 2\xi\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| + 4Vz_{\max},
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the ξ-slackness property and the assumption that $z_l^{(\xi)}(t)$ is i.i.d. over slots and hence independent of $Q_l[t]$. This further implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2 \mid \mathbf{Q}[t]\right]\\
\leq&\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2 - 2\xi\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| + B^2 + 4Vz_{\max}\\
=&\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2 - 2\xi\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| + B^2 + 4Vz_{\max} - \frac{\xi^2}{4} + \frac{\xi^2}{4}\\
=&\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2 - 2\xi\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| + \frac{B^2 + 4Vz_{\max} - \frac{\xi^2}{4}}{\xi}\cdot\xi + \frac{\xi^2}{4}\\
=&\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2 - 2\xi\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| + C_0V\cdot\xi + \frac{\xi^2}{4}\\
\leq&\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|^2 - \xi\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| + \frac{\xi^2}{4} = \left(\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| - \frac{\xi}{2}\right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from $(B^2 + 4Vz_{\max} - \frac{\xi^2}{4})/\xi = C_0V$ and the third inequality follows from the assumption $\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| \geq C_0V$. Now take the square root from both sides gives

$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2 \mid \mathbf{Q}[t]\right]} \leq \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| - \frac{\xi}{2}.$$

By concavity of $\sqrt{x}$ function, we have $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|_2 \mid \mathbf{Q}[t]\right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2 \mid \mathbf{Q}[t]\right]}$, thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\| \mid \mathbf{Q}[t]\right] \leq \|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| - \frac{\xi}{2},$$

finishing the proof. ■

The following lemma gives us a bound on the moments whenever a random process satisfies the drift condition in Lemma 6. Its proof is given in [8].

Lemma 7: Let $K[n]$ be a real random process over $n \in \{1, 2, \cdots\}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
&|K[n+1] - K[n]| \leq \gamma\\
&\mathbb{E}\left[K[n+1] - K[n] \mid K[n]\right] \leq \begin{cases}\gamma, & K[n] < \sigma;\\ -\beta, & K[n] \geq \sigma.\end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive real-valued σ, and $0 < \beta \leq \gamma$. Suppose $K[0] \in \mathbb{R}$ is finite, then, at every $n \in \{1, 2, \cdots\}$, the following holds:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{rK[n]}\right] \leq D + (e^{rK[1]} - D)\rho^n,$$

where $0 < \rho < 1$ and

$$r = \frac{\beta}{\gamma^2 + \gamma\beta/3},\quad \rho = 1 - \frac{r\beta}{2},\quad D = \frac{(e^{r\gamma} - \rho)e^{r\sigma}}{1-\rho}.$$

Using the above two lemmas, we have the following important corollary regarding the virtual queue vector.

Corollary 1: The following hold for any $t \in \{1, 2, \cdots\}$ under the drift-plus-penalty algorithm,

1. Bounded moments of virtual queues:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{r\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|}\right] \leq D, \tag{13}$$

where

$$r = \frac{3\xi}{6B^2 + B\xi},\ D = \frac{(4e^{rB} + r\xi - 4)e^{rC_0V}}{r\xi}.$$

2. Exponential decay: For any $c_1 > 0$,

$$Pr\left(\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| > c_1\right) \leq De^{-rc_1}. \tag{14}$$

Proof: The first part follows directly from Lemma 6 and Lemma 7 by plugging in $\gamma = B$ and $\beta = \xi/2$ in Lemma 7. The second part follows from

$$\begin{aligned} Pr\left(\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\| > c_1\right) &= Pr\left(e^{r\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|} > e^{rc_1}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{r\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|}\right]}{e^{rc_1}} \leq De^{-rc_1}. \end{aligned}$$

which is a direct application of Markov inequality. ∎

D. Putting everything together

The following is our main lemma on the performance of drift-plus-penalty algorithm.

Lemma 8: Under the proposed drift-plus-penalty algorithm, for any $\delta \in (0,1)$, and any $T \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &Pr\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]\right)\right. \\ &\left.\leq CV\frac{\max\left\{\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta},\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\geq 1-\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where $C = 2\sqrt{2}(2z_{\max}+\frac{B}{rV}+\frac{B}{rV}\log\left(\frac{8e^{rB}+2r\xi-8}{r\xi}\right)+BC_0)$ and C_0, r are defined in Lemma 6 and Corollary 1, respectively.

Proof: First of all, according to Corollary 1,

$$Pr(\mathcal{B}_t) \leq De^{-rc_1}.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T}Pr(\mathcal{B}_t) \leq DTe^{-rc_1}.$$

According to Lemma 5, we have

$$Pr(X[T]\geq\lambda) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2Tc_2^2}\right)+DTe^{-rc_1}. \tag{15}$$

For any $\delta \in (0,1)$, set $DTe^{-rc_1} = \delta/2$, then, we get $c_1 = \frac{1}{r}\log\frac{2DT}{\delta}$. Then, set

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2Tc_2^2}\right) = \delta/2,$$

which, by substituting the definition that $c_2 = 2Vz_{\max}+Bc_1$, implies

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \sqrt{2T\log\frac{2}{\delta}}\left(2Vz_{\max}+\frac{B}{r}\log\frac{2DT}{\delta}\right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}B}{r}\sqrt{T}\left(\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta}+\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \\ &\quad+\sqrt{2}\left(2Vz_{\max}+\frac{B}{r}\log(2D)\right)\sqrt{T}\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta} \\ &\leq \frac{CV}{2}\sqrt{T}\left(\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta}+\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right) \\ &\leq CV\sqrt{T}\max\left\{\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta},\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from simple algebra, the first inequality follows by substituting the definition of D in Corollary 1 and doing some simple algebra, and the final inequality follows from the fact that $a+b \leq 2\max\{a,b\}$. Substitute this choice of λ and the definition of $X[T]$ in Lemma 2 into (15) gives

$$\begin{aligned} &Pr\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]\right)\right. \\ &\left.\geq\frac{CV\max\left\{\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta},\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\leq\delta, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the claim. ∎

With the help of Lemma 8, we have the following theorem,

Theorem 2: Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$ and define $V = 1/\varepsilon$. Then, for any $T \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\max\left\{\log^2\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^3\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}$, with probability at least $1-2\delta$, one has:

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_0[t] \leq z^{opt}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_l[t] \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),\ \forall l\in\{1,2,\cdots,L\}, \tag{17}$$

and thus the drift-plus-penalty algorithm with parameter $V = 1/\varepsilon$ provides an $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ approximation with a convergence time $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\max\left\{\log^2\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^3\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}\right)$.

The proof is given in Appendix C applying Lemma 8 together with Corollary 1. First, Using the relation between $\Delta[t]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]$ in (10) and the fact that $\sum_{t=1}^{T}\Delta[t]$ is a telescoping sum equal to $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{Q}[T+1]\|^2$, we can get rid of the term $\sum_{i=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]$ in Lemma 8 and prove the ε-suboptimality on the objective. Then, we use the exponential decay of the virtual queue vector in Corollary 1 to bound the constraint violation.

IV. Improved Convergence Time under One Constraint

In this section, we show that when the problem (1)-(3) has only one constraint (i.e. $L = 1$), then, we can achieve the same ε approximation as (16) and (17) with probability at least $1-2\delta$ with a convergence time $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\log^2\frac{2}{\delta}\right)$. Compared to the previous result, we improved a logarithm factor.

A. A deterministic truncation

In the previous section, we truncate the original supermartingale $\{X[t]\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ using a stopping time. In this section, we show that if there is only one constraint, then, a deterministic truncation is enough to construct a new supermartingale with bounded difference.

Again assume the ξ-slackness assumption holds. The translation of Lemma 6 to the case of one constraint implies that:

$$|Q_1[t+1]-Q_1[t]| \leq B, \tag{18}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Q_1[t+1]-Q_1[t]|Q_1[t]\right] \leq \begin{cases} B, & \text{if } Q_1[t]\leq C_0V; \\ -\xi/2, & \text{if } Q_1[t]>C_0V, \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

where $C_0 \triangleq (4z_{\max}+\frac{B^2}{V}-\frac{\xi^2}{4V})/\xi$, and B is chosen so that $|z_1[t]| \leq B,\ \forall t$.

Lemma 9: If $L = 1$ in problem (1)-(3), then, the following inequality holds regarding the drift-plus-penalty algorithm for any $t \in \{1, 2, 3, \cdots\}$ and $V \geq B/C_0$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[V(z_0[t] - z^{opt}) + (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \leq 0,$$

where z^{opt} is the optimal value achieved by (1)-(3).

Proof: Since $Q_1[t] \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, we analyze the conditional expectation for the following two cases:
1. If $Q_1[t] \leq C_0 V$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[V(z_0[t] - z^{opt}) + (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\\ =&\mathbb{E}\left[V(z_0[t] - z^{opt}) + Q_1[t] z_1[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \leq 0,\end{aligned}$$

by key feature inequality (12).
2. If $Q_1[t] > C_0 V$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[Q_1[t+1] - Q_1[t] | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\\ =&\mathbb{E}\left[\max\{Q_1[t] + z_1[t], 0\} - Q[t] | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\\ =&\mathbb{E}\left[z_1[t] | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \leq -\xi/2,\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from the queue updating rule (4), the second equality follows from the fact when $Q_1[t] > C_0 V$ and $V \geq B/C_0$, the $\max\{\cdot\}$ can be removed, and the inequality follows from (19). Thus, the following chain of inequalities holds

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[V(z_0[t] - z^{opt}) + (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\\ =&\mathbb{E}\left[V(z_0[t] - z^{opt}) + C_0 V z_1[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\\ \leq&\mathbb{E}\left[2V z_{\max} + C_0 V z_1[t] \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\\ =&2V z_{\max} + C_0 V \mathbb{E}\left[z_1[t] | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\\ \leq&2V z_{\max} - C_0 V \xi/2.\end{aligned}$$

Substitute the definition $C_0 = (4z_{\max} + \frac{B^2}{V} - \frac{\xi^2}{4V})/\xi$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left[V(z_0[t] - z^{opt}) + (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t] \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\\ \leq&2V z_{\max} - \frac{V\xi}{2} \cdot \frac{4z_{\max} + \frac{B^2}{V} - \frac{\xi^2}{4V}}{\xi}\\ =&-(B^2 - \xi^2/4)/2 < 0,\end{aligned}$$

since B defined in Section II-B is chosen so that $|z_1[t]| \leq B,\ \forall t$. ∎

The following corollary follows directly from the above lemma. Its proof is similar to Lemma 2.

Corollary 2: Define a process $\{G[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ such that $G[0] = 0$ and

$$G[t] \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{t} \left(V(z_0[i] - z^{opt}) + (Q_1[i] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[i]\right).$$

Then, $\{G[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a supermartingale.

B. A detailed analysis of the truncated queue process

In Section II-C, we illustrated the relation between $\Delta[t]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{L} Q_l[t] z_l[t]$ in (10) thereby using the fact that $\sum_{t=1}^{T} \Delta[t]$ is a telescoping sum equal to $\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{Q}[T+1]\|^2$ to prove Theorem 2. However, since we have truncated the queue in the process $G[t]$, the telescoping relation does not hold for $\sum_{t=1}^{T}(Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t]$ anymore. The following argument shows that $\sum_{t=1}^{T}(Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t]$ is actually not far away from a telescoping sum.

Let n_j be the j-th time the queue process $Q_1[t]$ visits $[0, C_0 V]$ and $n_0 = 1$.[2] Define $\tau_j \triangleq n_{j+1} - n_j$ as the inter visit time period. Let n_J be the last time slot in $\{1, 2, \cdots, T+1\}$ that $Q_1[t]$ visits $[0, C_0 V]$. The following lemma analyzes the partial sum of $(Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t]$ from 1 to $n_J - 1$. Its proof involves a series of algebraic manipulations and is postponed to Appendix D.

Lemma 10: Suppose $n_J > 1$, then, the following holds for $V \geq B/C_0$,

$$\left|\sum_{t=1}^{n_J - 1} (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t] - \frac{1}{2} Q[n_J]^2\right| \leq \frac{5}{2} B^2 (n_J - 1),$$

where B is defined under (19).

Lemma 11: For any $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $V \geq B/C_0$, we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t] \geq -\frac{5}{2} B^2 T.$$

Proof: We analyze the following two cases:
1. If $n_J = T + 1$, then, by the above lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t] =& \sum_{t=1}^{n_J - 1} (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t]\\ \geq& \frac{1}{2} Q_1[T+1]^2 - \frac{5}{2} B^2 T\\ \geq& -\frac{5}{2} B^2 T.\end{aligned}$$

2. If $n_J < T + 1$, then, this implies that $Q_1[t] > C_0 V$, for all $t \in \{n_J + 1, \cdots, T+1\}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t]\\ =&\sum_{t=1}^{n_J - 1} (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t] + \sum_{t=n_J}^{T} (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t]\\ \geq&-\frac{5}{2} B^2 (n_J - 1) + \frac{1}{2} Q_1[n_J]^2 + \sum_{t=n_J}^{T} (Q_1[t] \wedge C_0 V) z_1[t]\\ =&-\frac{5}{2} B^2 (n_J - 1) + \frac{1}{2} Q_1[n_J]^2 + \sum_{t=n_J+1}^{T} C_0 V z_1[t]\\ &+ Q_1[n_J] z_1[n_J]\\ \geq&-\frac{5}{2} B^2 (n_J - 1) + \frac{1}{2} Q_1[n_J]^2 + C_0 V \sum_{t=n_J}^{T} z_1[t] - B^2.\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last steps follows from the fact $Q_1[t] > C_0 V$ for $t \in \{n_J + 1, \cdots, T\}$ and the last step follows from $C_0 V \geq Q_1[n_J] > C_0 V - B$.

Since $V \geq B/C_0$, it follows, $Q_1[t+1] = Q_1[t] + z_1[t],\ \forall t \in \{n_J, \cdots, T\}$. Since $Q_1[T+1] > C_0 V\ Q_1[n_J] \leq C_0 V$, we have

$$\sum_{t=n_J}^{T} z_1[t] = Q_1[T+1] - Q_1[n_J] > 0.$$

[2]If $Q_1[t]$ stays within $[0, C_0 V]$ for two consecutive time slots t and $t+1$, then, they are counted as two times.

Thus,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T}(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]\geq -\frac{5}{2}B^2n_J\geq -\frac{5}{2}B^2T,$$

finishing the proof. ∎

C. Convergence time analysis

The following lemma is a direct application of Lemma 4 and Corollary 2.

Lemma 12: Under the proposed drift-plus-penalty algorithm, for any $\delta\in(0,1)$, any $T\in\mathbb{N}$ and any $V\geq B/C_0$,

$$Pr\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})+(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]\right)\right.$$
$$\left.\leq 2C_2V\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\geq 1-\delta,$$

where $C_2=2z_{\max}+C_0B$, and C_0 is defined under (19).

Proof: First of all, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|G[t]-G[t-1]|=&|V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})+(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]|\\ \leq&2Vz_{\max}+C_0VB\end{aligned}$$

Thus, let $C_2\triangleq 2z_{\max}+C_0B$ and by Lemma 4 and Corollary 2,

$$Pr(G[T]\geq\lambda)\leq\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2TC_2^2V^2}\right).$$

Let $\delta=\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2TC_2^2V^2}\right)$, we get $\lambda=2C_2\sqrt{T}\log\frac{1}{\delta}$. Thus,

$$Pr\left(G[T]\geq 2C_2V\sqrt{T}\log\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\leq\delta,$$

which implies

$$Pr\left(\frac{1}{T}G[T]\geq 2C_2V\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\leq\delta,$$

finishing the proof. ∎

The following is our main theorem regarding the convergence time.

Theorem 3: Fix $\varepsilon\in(0,C_0/B]$, $\delta\in(0,1)$ and define $V=1/\varepsilon$. Then, for any $T\geq\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\log^2\frac{1}{\delta}$, with probability at least $1-2\delta$, one has:

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_0[t]\leq z^{opt}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),\tag{20}$$

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_1[t]\leq\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon),\tag{21}$$

and so the drift-plus-penalty algorithm with parameter $V=1/\varepsilon$ provides an $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ approximation with a convergence time $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\log^2\frac{1}{\delta}\right)$.

The proof given in Appendix E is similar to the proof of Theorem 2. First, we use Lemma 11 to get rid of the term $(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]$ in Lemma 12, thereby proving the ε-suboptimality on the objective. Then, we pass the exponential decay of the virtual queue in Corollary 1 to one constraint case and bound the constraint violation.

Appendix A
Proof of Property 2 in Lemma 3

This appendix proves that the truncated process $\{Y[t]\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ has bounded difference. We have for any $t\geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|Y[t]-Y[t-1]|\\ =&|X[t\wedge(\tau-1)]-X[(t-1)\wedge(\tau-1)]|\\ =&\left|\left(X[t\wedge(\tau-1)]-X[(t-1)\wedge(\tau-1)]\right)1_{\{\tau-1\geq t\}}\right.\\ &\left.+\left(X[t\wedge(\tau-1)]-X[(t-1)\wedge(\tau-1)]\right)1_{\{\tau-1<t\}}\right|\\ =&\left|\left(X[t]-X[t-1]\right)1_{\{\tau-1\geq t\}}\right.\\ &\left.+\left(X[\tau-1]-X[\tau-1]\right)1_{\{\tau-1<t\}}\right|\\ =&|X[t]-X[t-1]|\,1_{\{\tau-1\geq t\}}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, according to the definition of $X[t]$ in Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|X[t]-X[t-1]|=&\left|V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]\right|\\ \leq&2Vz_{\max}+\left|\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]\right|\\ \leq&2Vz_{\max}+B\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|,\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and Assumption 1. On the set $\{\tau-1\geq t\}$, $\|\mathbf{Q}[t]\|\leq c_1$, thus, we get,

$$\begin{aligned}|X[t]-X[t-1]|\,1_{\{\tau-1\geq t\}}\leq&\left(2Vz_{\max}+Bc_1\right)1_{\{\tau-1\geq t\}}\\ \leq&2Vz_{\max}+Bc_1,\end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof.

Appendix B
Proof of Lemma 4

We first show a generalized Hoeffding's lemma as follows: For any $i\in\mathbb{N}$ and any $s>0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{s(Y[t]-Y[t-1])}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\leq e^{s^2c_2^2/2}.\tag{22}$$

For simplicity of notations, let $X\triangleq Y[t]-Y[t-1]$, then we have for any $t\in\mathbb{N}$ and any $s>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}e^{sX}=&e^{sc_2\cdot\frac{X}{c_2}}\leq\frac{1-\frac{X}{c_2}}{2}e^{-sc_2}+\frac{1+\frac{X}{c_2}}{2}e^{sc_2}\\ \leq&\frac{1}{2}\left(e^{sc_2}+e^{-sc_2}\right)+\frac{X}{2c_2}\left(e^{sc_2}-e^{-sc_2}\right)\\ \leq&e^{s^2c_2^2/2}+\frac{X}{2c_2}\left(e^{sc_2}-e^{-sc_2}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from convexity of the function e^{sc_2x} and the fact that $\frac{X}{c_2}\in[-1,1]$, the third inequality follows from taking Taylor expansion of the term $e^{sc_2}+e^{-sc_2}$. Take conditional expectation from both sides gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{sX}|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]=&e^{s^2c_2^2/2}+\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[X|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]}{2c_2}\left(e^{sc_2}-e^{-sc_2}\right)\\ \leq&e^{s^2c_2^2/2},\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that $Y[t]$ is a supermartingale thus $\mathbb{E}\left[X|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \leq 0$. This finishes the proof of (22). Now, consider

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{sY[T]}\right] =&\mathbb{E}\left[e^{s(Y[T]-Y[T-1]+Y[T-1])}\right]\\ =&\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[e^{s(Y[T]-Y[T-1]+Y[T-1])}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}\right]\right]\\ =&\mathbb{E}\left[e^{sY[T-1]}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{s(Y[T]-Y[T-1])}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}\right]\right]\\ \leq&\mathbb{E}\left[e^{sY[T-1]}\right]e^{s^2c_2^2/2}.\end{aligned}$$

By recursively applying above technique $T-1$ times with the fact that $X_0 = 0$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{sY[T]}\right] \leq e^{\frac{s^2Tc_2^2}{2}}.$$

Finally, by applying above inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}Pr\left(Y[T] \geq \lambda\right) =&Pr\left(e^{sY[T]} \geq e^{s\lambda}\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{sY[T]}\right]}{e^{s\lambda}}\\ \leq&e^{-s\lambda+\frac{s^2Tc_2^2}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Optimize the bound regarding s on the right hand side gives the optimal $s^* = \frac{\lambda}{Tc_2^2}$ and the bound follows.

Appendix C
Proof of Theorem 2

1) We first show the ε near optimality. According to (10), it follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})+\sum_{l=1}^{L}Q_l[t]z_l[t]\right)\\ \geq&\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\left(\Delta[t]-\frac{B^2}{2}+V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})\right)\\ =&\frac{1}{T}\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2-\frac{B^2}{2}+\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}V(z_0[t]-z^{opt}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 8, with probability $1-\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{T}\|\mathbf{Q}[t+1]\|^2-\frac{B^2}{2}+\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}V(z_0[t]-z^{opt})\\ \leq&CV\frac{\max\left\{\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta},\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}{\sqrt{T}},\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_0[t] \leq&z^{opt}+\frac{C\max\left\{\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta},\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}{\sqrt{T}}\\ &+\frac{B^2}{2V}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, substituting $V = 1/\varepsilon$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_0[t] \leq&z^{opt}+\frac{C\max\left\{\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta},\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}{\sqrt{T}}\\ &+\frac{B^2\varepsilon}{2},\end{aligned}$$

where C has the order $\mathcal{O}(1)$ when ε is small. Then, substitute $T \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\max\left\{\log^2\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^3\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}$ on the right hand side gives (23). Thus, with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_0[t] \leq z^{opt}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

2) We then show the constraint violation. By queue updating rule (4), for any t and any $l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\}$, one has

$$Q_l[t+1] \geq Q_l[t]+z_l[t].$$

Thus, summing over $t = 1,2,\cdots,T$,

$$Q_l[T+1] \geq Q_l[1]+\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_l[t].$$

Since $Q_l[1] = 0$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_l[t] \leq \frac{Q_l[T+1]}{T}. \tag{24}$$

Recall from Corollary 1 that we have

$$Pr\left(\|\mathbf{Q}[T+1]\| > c_1\right) \leq De^{-rc_1}.$$

Let $De^{-rc_1} = \delta$ and substituting the definition of D in Corollary 1 give

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{r}\log\frac{D}{\delta} = \frac{1}{r}\log\frac{1}{\delta}+C_0V.$$

Thus,

$$Pr\left(\|\mathbf{Q}[T+1]\| > \frac{1}{r}\log\frac{1}{\delta}+C_0V\right) < \delta.$$

This implies with probability at least $1-\delta$, for any $l \in \{1,2,\cdots,L\}$,

$$\frac{1}{T}Q_l[T+1] \leq \frac{1}{rT}\log\frac{1}{\delta}+\frac{C_0V}{T}.$$

Substitute $T \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\max\left\{\log^2\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^3\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}$ and $V = 1/\varepsilon$ on the right hand side gives

$$\frac{1}{T}Q_l[T+1] \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

By (24), we have with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_l[t] \leq \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Since both (16) and (17) hold individually with probability at least $1-\delta$, by union bound, with probability at least $1-2\delta$, we have the two conditions hold simultaneously.

$$\frac{C\max\left\{\log T\log^{1/2}\frac{2}{\delta},\log^{3/2}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}{\sqrt{T}}\leq\frac{C\max\left\{\left(2\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}+\log\left(\max\left\{\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}\right)\right)\log^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\max\left\{\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}$$
$$\leq\frac{C\left(3\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta}+3\log^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\max\left\{\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\log^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta},\ \log^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{2}{\delta}\right\}}\leq 6C\varepsilon. \tag{23}$$

Appendix D
Proof of Lemma 10

Consider any inter-visit period n_j to n_{j+1},

1. If $\tau_j=1$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_{j+1}]^2-Q_1[n_j]^2\right)-(Q[n_j]\wedge C_0V)z_1[n_j]\right|\\ =&\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+1]^2-Q_1[n_j]^2\right)-Q[n_j]z_1[n_j]\right|\\ \leq&\frac{1}{2}z_1[n_j]^2\leq\frac{1}{2}B^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from the fact that $Q_1[n_j]\in[0,C_0V]$, and the inequality follows by expanding the $Q_1[n_j+1]^2$ term.

2. If $\tau_j>1$, then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q_1[n_j]^2\right)-\sum_{t=n_j}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]\right|\\ \leq&\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q_1[n_j+1]^2\right)-C_0V\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t]\right|\\ &+\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+1]^2-Q_1[n_j]^2\right)-Q[n_j]z_1[n_j]\right|\\ \leq&\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q_1[n_j+1]^2\right)-C_0V\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t]\right|\\ &+B^2/2\\ \leq&\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q_1[n_j+1]^2\right)-Q_1[n_j+1]\right.\\ &\left.\cdot\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t]\right|+\left|(Q_1[n_j+1]-C_0V)\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t]\right|\\ &+B^2/2\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from $Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V=C_0V$ from n_j+1 to $n_j+\tau_j-1$ and triangle inequality, the second inequality follows from $\tau_j=1$ case and the last inequality follows from triangle inequality again. Now we try to bound the two terms in the last inequality separately.

- $\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q_1[n_j+1]^2\right)-Q_1[n_j+1]\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t]\right|\leq 2B^2$:
  Since $V\geq B/C_0$ and $Q_1[t]>C_0V$ for any $t\in\{n_j+1,\cdots,n_j+\tau_j-1\}$, according to the queue updating rule, $Q_1[t+1]=Q_1[t]+z_1[t],\ \forall t\in\{n_j,\cdots,n_j+\tau_j-1\}$.
  This gives
  $$Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]=Q_1[n_j+1]+\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t].$$
  Thus,
  $$\left|\frac{1}{2}(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q_1[n_j+1]^2)-Q_1[n_j+1]\cdot\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t]\right|=\frac{1}{2}\left|\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t]\right|^2.$$
  Notice that
  $$C_0V\geq Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]\geq Q_1[n_j+\tau_j-1]-B\geq C_0V-B,$$
  $$C_0V\leq Q_1[n_j+1]\leq Q_1[n_j]+B\leq C_0V+B,$$
  thus, $\left|\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[t]\right|^2=|Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]-Q_1[n_j+1]|^2\leq(2B)^2=4B^2$, and this gives the desired bound.
- $\left|(Q_1[n_j+1]-C_0V)\sum_{t=n_j+1}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}z_1[i]\right|\leq(\tau_j-1)B^2$:
  Since $C_0V\leq Q[n_j+1]\leq C_0V+B$, it follows
  $$|Q[n_j+1]-C_0V|\leq B.$$
  Thus, the desired bound follows from $|z_1[t]|\leq B$.

Above all, we get for $\tau_j>1$,

$$\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q_1[n_j]^2\right)-\sum_{t=n_j}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]\right|\leq 2B^2+(\tau_j-1)B^2+B^2/2=\left(\tau_j+\frac{3}{2}\right)B^2.$$

Thus, for any τ_j,

$$\left|\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q[n_j]^2\right)-\sum_{t=n_j}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]\right|\leq\left(\tau_j+\frac{3}{2}\right)B^2,$$

Take the sums of j from 0 to $J-1$ from both sides gives

$$\sum_{j=0}^{J-1}\left|\sum_{t=n_j}^{n_j+\tau_j-1}(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]-\frac{1}{2}\left(Q_1[n_j+\tau_j]^2-Q_1[n_j]^2\right)\right|\leq\sum_{j=0}^{J-1}\left(\tau_j+\frac{3}{2}\right)B^2.$$

By triangle inequality,

$$\left|\sum_{t=0}^{n_J-1}(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]-\frac{1}{2}Q_1[n_J]^2\right| \le \sum_{j=0}^{J-1}\left(\tau_j+\frac{3}{2}\right)B^2 \le \frac{5}{2}B^2(n_J-1),$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\sum_{j=0}^{J-1}\tau_j = n_J-1$ and $J\le n_J-1$.

Appendix E
Proof of Theorem 3

First of all, substitute the bound of $\sum_{t=1}^{T}(Q_1[t]\wedge C_0V)z_1[t]$ derived in Lemma 11 into Lemma 12 gives, with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}V(z_0[t]-z^{opt}) \le 2C_2V\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{\sqrt{T}}+\frac{5}{2}B^2.$$

Divide V from both sides gives

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(z_0[t]-z^{opt}) \le 2C_2\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{\sqrt{T}}+\frac{5}{2}\frac{B^2}{V}.$$

Substitute $V=1/\varepsilon$ and $T=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\log^2\frac{1}{\delta}$ into the right hand side of the above inequality gives

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(z_0[t]-z^{opt}) \le 2C_2\varepsilon+\frac{5}{2}B^2\varepsilon=\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \tag{25}$$

Then, we do the constraint violation. By queue updating rule (4), for any t, one has

$$Q_1[t+1]\ge Q_1[t]+z_1[t].$$

Thus, summing over $t=1,2,\cdots,T$,

$$Q_1[T+1]\ge Q_1[1]+\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_1[t].$$

Since $Q_1[1]=0$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_1[t]\le\frac{Q_1[T+1]}{T}. \tag{26}$$

Recall from Corollary 1 that we have

$$Pr\left(Q_1[T+1]>c_1\right)\le De^{-rc_1}.$$

Let $De^{-rc_1}=\delta$ and substituting the definition of D in Corollary 1 give

$$c_1=\frac{1}{r}\log\frac{D}{\delta}=\frac{1}{r}\log\frac{1}{\delta}+C_0V.$$

Thus,

$$Pr\left(Q_1[T+1]>\frac{1}{r}\log\frac{1}{\delta}+C_0V\right)<\delta.$$

This implies with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\frac{1}{T}Q_1[T+1]\le\frac{1}{rT}\log\frac{1}{\delta}+\frac{C_0V}{T}.$$

Substitute $V=1/\varepsilon$ and $T=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\log^2\frac{1}{\delta}$ into the right hand side of the above inequality gives

$$\frac{1}{T}Q_1[T+1]\le\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

By (26), we have with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}z_1[t]\le\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon).$$

Since both (20) and (21) hold individually with probability at least $1-\delta$, by union bound, with probability at least $1-2\delta$, we have the two conditions hold simultaneously.

References

[1] L. Tassiulas and A. Ephremides. Dynamic server allocation to parallel queues with randomly varying connectivity. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 466-478, Mar. 1993.

[2] L. Tassiulas and A. Ephremides. Stability properties of constrained queueing systems and scheduling policies for maximum throughput in multihop radio networks. *IEEE Transacations on Automatic Control*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 1936-1948, Dec. 1992.

[3] M. J. Neely, E. Modiano, and C. Li. Fairness and optimal stochastic control for heterogeneous networks. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 396-409, Apr. 2008.

[4] M. J. Neely. *Stochastic Network Optimization with Application to Communication and Queueing Systems*. Morgan & Claypool, 2010.

[5] M. J. Neely. Stability and probability 1 convergence for queueing networks via Lyapunov optimization. *Journal of Applied Mathematics*, doi:10.1155/2012/831909, 2012.

[6] M. J. Neely, Distributed Stochastic Optimization via Correlated Scheduling, *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, Toronto, CA, 2014.

[7] S. Supittayapornpong, L. Huang, and M. J. Neely. Time-average optimization with nonconvex decision set and its convergence. *In Proc. IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Los Angeles, California, Dec. 2014.

[8] M. J. Neely. Energy-aware wireless scheduling with near optimal backlog and convergence time tradeoffs. *ArXiv technical report, arXiv:1411.4740*, Nov. 2014.

[9] A. Ribeiro, Ergodic Stochastic Optimization Algorithms for Wireless Communication and Networking. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 12, pp. 6369-6386, Jan. 2011.

[10] A. Nedic and A. Ozdaglar, Approximate primal solutions and rate analysis for dual subgradient methods, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 1757-1780, 2009.

[11] X. Lin and N. B. Shroff. Joint rate control and scheduling in multihop wireless networks. *Proc. of 43rd IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, Paradise Island, Bahamas, Dec. 2004.

[12] J. W. Lee, R. R. Mazumdar, and N. B. Shroff. Opportunistic power scheduling for dynamic multiserver wireless systems. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 1506-1515, Jun. 2006.

[13] A. Eryilmaz and R. Srikant, Joint congestion control, routing, and MAC for stability and fairness in wireless networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, Special Issue on Nonlinear Optimization of Communication Systems*, vol. 14, pp. 1514-1524, Aug. 2006.

[14] A. Eryilmaz and R. Srikant, Fair Resource Allocation in Wireless Networks using Queue-Length-Based Scheduling and Congestion Control. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 1333-1344, Dec. 2007.

[15] A. Stolyar, Maximizing Queueing Network Utility subject to Stability: Greedy Primal-Dual Algorithm. *Queueing Systems*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 401-457, 2005.

[16] A. Stolyar, Greedy primal-dual algorithm for dynamic resource allocation in complex networks. *Queueing Systems*. vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 203-220, 2006.

[17] F. R. K. Chung and L. Lu. *Complex Graphs and Networks*, volumn 107 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, 2006.

[18] R. Durrett, *Probability: Theory and Examples, 4th ed.*, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

[19] B. Hajek, Hitting-time and occupation-time bounds implied by drift analysis with applications, *Advances in Applied Probability*, vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 502-525, Sep. 1982.